



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

9/14
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/467,992	12/20/1999	LEONARD FORBES	303.389US2	3099

21186 7590 10/29/2002
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

LEE, EUGENE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/467,992	Applicant(s)	FORBES ET AL.
Examiner	Eugene Lee	Art Unit	2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 17-19,22,23,25-27,29 and 31-51 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 17-19,22,23,25-27,29 and 31-51 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 13 August 2002 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/13/02 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 43, the applicant states "formed as a pillar of single-crystal semiconductor material", however, claim 41 states a "lateral transistor". A lateral transistor can not have a pillar as described by the disclosure, and since claim 43 is dependent on claim 41, these claims are contradictory. Appropriate clarification and correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 17 thru 19, 31 thru 33, 37, 38, 41 thru 46, 48, 49, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfiester 4,761,385 in view of Kanetaki et al. 4,906,590. Pfiester discloses (see, for example, FIG. 1) a memory cell comprising a lateral transistor 56, source/drain regions 54, semiconductor material layer (body region) 32, trench capacitor 50, substrate (first plate) 34, capacitor plate (second plate of polycrystalline material) 66, and dielectric layer (insulator layer) 60. A contact from the capacitor plate extends to the source/drain region. The substrate is integral to either source/drain region since the source/drain region is part of the substrate. Pfiester does not disclose a first micro-roughened polysilicon surface and a second micro-roughened polysilicon surface. However, Kanetaki shows (see, for example, FIG. 2) a trench capacitor containing two plurality of hollows (roughened surfaces). In column 1, lines 11- *, Kanetaki states that the plurality of hollows increases the electrode area without increasing the planar area. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the plurality of hollows (roughened surfaces) in Pfiester's invention in order to increase the electrode area.

5. Claims 22, 23, 25, 34 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh '389 in view of Kanetaki et al. '590. Itoh discloses (see, for example, FIG_ 8(k)) a memory cell comprising a low electric resistance region (first source/drain region) 232, high electric resistance semiconductor layer (body region) 204, low electric resistance semiconductor layer (second source/drain region) 202 and a highly electroconductive layer (second plate) 216. The low electric resistance semiconductor layer 202 also serves as a first electrode (first plate) of

a capacitor. See, for example, column 13, lines 18-32 of Itoh. In column 10, lines 31-41, Itoh discloses the highly electroconductive layer comprising polycrystalline silicon. Itoh does not disclose an etch-roughened surface. However, Kanetaki shows (see, for example, FIG. 2) a trench capacitor containing two plurality of hollows (roughened surfaces). In column 1, lines 11-*, Kanetaki states that the plurality of hollows increases the electrode area without increasing the planar area. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the plurality of hollows (roughened surfaces) in Itoh's invention in order to increase the electrode area.

6. Claims 26, 27, 29, 35, 36, 40, 47, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfiester '385 in view of Kanetaki et al. '590 as applied to claims 17-19, 31 thru 33, 37, 38, 41 thru 46, 48, 49, and 51 above, and further in view of Wahlstrom 5,396,452. Pfiester in view of Kanetaki does not disclose word lines disposed substantially orthogonal to the bit lines, and a row decoder and column decoder so as to selectively access the cells of the array. However, Wahlstrom discloses (see, for example, FIG. 2) a dynamic random access memory comprising memory cells arranged in an array wherein word lines (WL) are arranged orthogonal to bit lines (BL). In FIG. 1, Wahlstrom shows a row decoder and a column decoder which access the memory cells in the array according to the row and column addresses applied. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to arrange the word lines and bit lines orthogonally, and have a column and row decoder in order to form a memory cell array wherein the individual memory cells may be accessed easily.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-19, 22, 23, 25-27, 29, and 31-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

INFORMATION ON HOW TO CONTACT THE USPTO

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Lee whose telephone number is 703-305-5695. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie C. Lee can be reached on 703-308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Eugene Lee
October 26, 2002



EDDIE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800